



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

1-D

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/327,594 06/08/99 DEMIRYONT

H 03897.08139

IM52/0214

PETER D MCDERMOTT
BANNER & WITCOFF LTD
28 STATE STREET 28TH FLOOR
BOSTON MA 02109

EXAMINER

MIRANDA, L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1775

DATE MAILED:

02/14/01

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/327,594	Applicant(s) DEMIRYONT, HULYA	
	Examiner Lymarie Miranda	Art Unit 1775	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 15) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 16) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 17) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u> . | 20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of claims 1-14 in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "st, ts" in claim 4 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "st, ts" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1775

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1 and 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Breininger et al. (US 4170461).

Breininger discloses a cuprous oxide film deposited onto a transparent non-metallic substrate, preferably soda-lime-silica glass. Cuprous oxide coated articles are heat treated to effect an alteration in the color of transmitted light. (col. 2, lines 22-26 and 39). On example 1 a flat sheet of soda-lime-silica glass is coated with cuprous oxide and appears blue-green at the film surface and yellow-green at the glass surface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breininger et al. as applied to claims 1 and 3-8 supra.

Breininger discloses the claimed invention except for the layers thickness and the curvo-planar substrate. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the layer thickness, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering

Art Unit: 1775

the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Regarding the form of the substrate, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use a curvo-planar substrate, since applicant has not disclosed that such limitation solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with either a planar or curved substrate.

8. Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breininger et al. as applied to claims 1 and 3-8 and further in view of Kawazu et al. (US 5876854)

Breininger discloses the claimed invention except for the presence of a coloration layer. However, Kawazu discloses a UV absorbing, colored film-covered glass article with an intermediate layer having a coloring metal oxides including zinc oxide (col. 7, lines 1-6). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a second coloring layer to Breininger laminate as disclosed by Kawazu, since by this the UV absorbing power is enhanced and the visible light transmittance can be controlled (col. 7, lines 7-9).

Regarding claim 14, the references are silent with respect to the layer thickness, however it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the layer thickness, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lymarie Miranda whose telephone number is (703) 308-6370. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (703) 308-3822. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 305-3599 for regular communications and 305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 306-0661.


LM

January 30, 2001


DEBORAH JONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER